



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,208	11/16/2003	Catherine L. Funderburk	2547.001	2548
40842	7590	06/17/2008		
B. CRAIG KILLOUGH				
P. O. DRAWER H				
CHARLESTON, SC 29402				
EXAMINER				
DESAL, ANISH P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,208

Applicant(s)

FUNDERBURK ET AL.

Examiner

ANISH DESAI

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 30-34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed on 04/10/07 after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 04/10/07 and 04/18/07 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-29 are cancelled. Claims 30-38 are pending.
3. Claims 30-34 are continued to be indicated as allowed as suggested by the previous Examiner in 04/06/07 Advisory Action. Additionally, in accordance with MPEP 704, full faith and credit is given to the search and action of the previous Examiner.
4. A new 35 USC Section 112-second paragraph rejection to claims 37 and 38 is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 37 and 38 depend from independent claim 35 which requires that an adhesive and a color former be coated on a support material. Claims 37 and 38 require the support material having first layer (claims 37, 38), second layer (claims 37, 38), and

Art Unit: 1794

third layer (claim 38) coated on the support material. Further, these claims require presence of an adhesive, a color former, and a color developer. However, it is not clear whether the adhesive, color developer, and the color former as recited by claims 37 and 38 are same or different from those as set forth in claims 35. Further, claims 35 requires a coating of an adhesive and a color former on the support, thus it is not clear whether the additional layers on the support which include an adhesive, a color former, and a color developer as set forth by claims 37-38 are in addition to the adhesive and a color former of claim 35. In other words, does the roll of tape of claims 37 and 38 include an adhesive and a color former coated on the support (claim 35) AND the support further having first, second, and a third layer coated on it; wherein these layers include an adhesive, a color former, and a color developer? As such, the claims appear to be grammatically ambiguous and the scope becomes unclear since it is not determinable what structure can fall within the scope of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Posa et al. (US 6,767,628B1).

7. Posa discloses a roll of tape (see Figures) that includes a material which enhances the visibility of a newly formed edge (abstract). The tape of Posa includes a backing 404 (support material) having a coating of an adhesive 306 (see Figure 3 and Figure 4). Further, Posa teaches that "In an alternate embodiment...one or more materials may be added to the base layer and/or adhesive, or used in conjunction with the adhesive, causing a cut or torn edge to be visually evident through mechanisms other than fluorescence. As one example, a chemical agent may be added to the adhesive, which when exposed to oxygen [equated to color developer since Applicant has not specify what type of color developer he/she is using in the claims], results in a color change causing a newly-formed edge to become visually evident." (column 4 lines 54-61). As a chemical agent Posa discloses lecuodye (column 5 lines 1-5) which is equated to claimed color former. Moreover, Posa discloses that the color-changing compounds [color former] may instead be contained within microcapsules, preferably applied to the adhesive side of the tape base. As such when the tape is cut, torn or severed, microcapsules are broken, enabling the material which discolors to flow therefrom (column 5 lines 15-30).

8. As to the claim requirements of when a portion of said length of support material is separated from a remainder of said length of said support material, wherein said demarcation is of contrasting color to said support material, these limitations are obvious in view of the aforementioned disclosure of Posa, motivated by the desire to form a roll of tape where a free end can be easily identified.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/10/07 and 04/18/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. Applicant argues that Posa reference only teaches that fluorescent materials are color formers that react with oxygen. Posa therefore do not present a color developer that is present in separate layers in an adhesive, as required by Claim 35. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Posa discloses that the chemical agent contained in his/her adhesive layer when exposed to oxygen changes color (column 4 lines 55-65). It is noted that Applicant's claim does not define what type of color developer he/she is using; instead claims broadly recite "color developer". Thus the chemical agent and oxygen of Posa are equated to a color former and a color developer respectively. Further, as to Applicant's arguments that Posa do not present a color developer in a separate layer in an adhesive, these arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. The claims do not require a color developer in a separate layer in an adhesive as asserted by Applicant. The claims recite a color developer be presented at a tear site (please see recitation "and said color former that is present at said tear site is exposed to a **color developer at said tear site**" in claim 35). The color developer is not part of the tape. Accordingly, the art rejections are sustained.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANISH DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-6467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM-4:30PM.
12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Hai Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794